

No.69/2020 dated: 31-12-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 05-01-2021 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.21 of 2020	CREDAI Chennai Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	M.P.No.37 of 2020	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	M.P.No.38 of 2020	CFC/TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To grant time extension for filing Aggregate Revenue Requirement for the MYT control period FY 2019-20 to FY 2021-22 till 31st January 2021. For admission.
4	M.P.No.39 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus (i) Sri Jayavilas Subbaraj Spinning Mills (Pvt.) Limited (ii) GHCL Ltd (iii) Thiagarajar Mills Pvt. Limited (iv) Bannari Amman Spinning Mills (v) Shiva Mills Ltd (vi) Sri Jayajothi & Co. Pvt. Limited (vii) Vijay Spinners (RJPM) Pvt. Limited (viii) Guruvayurappan Textiles Pvt. Limited (ix) TASMA (x) The Rajaratna Mills Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To approve to the format of "Status Report" to be obtained from the SE/EDCs concerned and to submit by the HT consumers who seeks open access. For admission.

5	P.R.C.No.1 of 2020	Tmt. Tara Murali W/o. Mr.N.Murali No.260A, TTK Road Chennai - 600 018 Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/Central (iii) EE/O&M/T.Nagar (iv) AE/Teynampet	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the respondents 2 to 4 for demanding a sum of Rs.13,90,100/- vide impugned procs. Dt.4.12.2020 and 7.12.2020 for effecting LT-3 Phase service connection to a load of 42 KW under Tariff 1A and a common service connection to a load of 5 KW under Tariff 1A for the petitioner's premises, in contravention of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Regulations made by the Commission. For maintainability.
6	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & R.P.No.5 of 2020 in M.P.No.27 of 2016	TANGEDCO Versus M/s.SEPC Power Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Review the order of the Commission dt.10.1.2020 in M.P.No.27 of 2016 and reject the prayer in M.P.No.27 of 2016. For condonation of delay and admission.
7	T.A.No.2 of 2020 (Transferred by the Madurai Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.(MD) Nos.14514 & 14525 of 2020 & WMP(MD) Nos.12170, 12174, 12183 & 12184 of 2020)	M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus i CMD/TANGEDCO ii Chairman/TANTRANSCO iii SE/Ramnad EDC iv CFC/Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Directions issued by the Madurai Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.(MD) Nos.14514 & 14525 of 2020 and WMP (MD) Nos.12170, 12174, 12183 & 12184 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.
8	D.R.P.No.11 of 2019	M/s.Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/NCES/TANGEDCO 3) SE/EDC, Tirunelveli	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to refund the balance amount of Rs.5.72 crores for the period upto March 2018 that has been collected on the basis of erroneous application of the Amendment dated 19.6.2013 along with interest of Rs.2.30 crores. For arguments.

9	M.P.No.34 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.CWRE Wind Power Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Rahul Balaji	To cancel captive wheeling of energy in respect of M/s.CWRE Wind Power Pvt. Limited with effect from 13.6.2018 treated as third party transaction as per law and their captive users are liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge for such disqualification of Captive status. For counter.
10	D.R.P.No.20 of 2020	M/s.Intersnack Cashew India Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare that the levy of the amount of Rs.77,20,967 and the subsequent inclusion of the said amount in the current consumption bill dated 4.9.2020 in respect of HT SC.No.282 of the petitioner is illegal and liable to be set aside and direct to refund the above amount along with interest till pendente lite. For counter.
11	D.R.P.No.22 of 2020	M/s.SSMT Power Private Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC/Revenue iii) CE/NCES iv) SE/OA & Co-ordination, SLDC.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct Rollover of banked electricity from the CGP Renewbale Energy Generating Plant of the petitioner under Captive Category of FY-2019-2020-FY-2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation since the accumulation of excess banked units of value of Rs.2,58,01,600/- for FY-2019-2020 and the Captive Consumers ought to be permitted to adjust the unutilised banked units as payments. For counter.
12	D.R.P.No.44 of 2014	Mirra and Mirra Industries Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct TANGEDCO to effect adjustment of the WEG from the petitioner's captive windmills operating under the REC scheme first and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.

13	D.R.P.No.55 of 2014	SRF Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to first effect adjustment of WEG under REC scheme and thereafter adjust with banking facility. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.
14	D.R.P.No.68 of 2014	Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai EDC 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct that TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.47 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
15	D.R.P.No.69 of 2014	Sundaram Textiles Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai/North 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.203 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
16	D.R.P.No.3 of 2016	M/s. Mitra Fidelity Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.66.22/-lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
17	D.R.P.No.4 of 2016	M/s. Greenweiz Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.28.39/-lakhs with interest. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.

18	D.R.P.No.5 of 2016	M/s. Tapi Energy Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.13.04/- lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
19	D.R.P.No.58 of 2014	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For arguments.
20	D.R.P.No.81 of 2014	Dalmia Bharat and Sugar Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2 CFC, TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a total sum of Rs.3.8/- crores. For arguments.
21	D.R.P.No.3 of 2015	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.50.70 crores being the interest due. For arguments.
22	D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	Birla Carbon India Pvt. Limited (Formerly M/s.SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt. Limited) Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the outstanding payments of Rs.1.10 crores along with interest of Rs.23.03 lakhs. For arguments.
23	D.R.P.No.2 of 2016	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
24	D.R.P.No.6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.32 crores. For arguments.
25	D.R.P.No.9 of 2016	Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Edumalpet EDC & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the impugned notices dated 4-8-2014 and 2-12-2014 issued by the 1 st and 2 nd respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For filing affidavit and for arguments.
26	D.R.P.No.11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For filing affidavit and for arguments.

27	M.P.No.21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association (IWPA) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For arguments of the respondent.
28	D.R.P.No.2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3.89 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.1.68 crores. For arguments.
29	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.18 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.21.79 lakhs. For arguments.
30	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments.
31	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.
32	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.
33	D.R.P.No.6 of 2020	M/s.Kamal Encon Industries Limited Versus i)CMD / TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC iv) CFC/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.1.16 crore along with interest for the wind power supplied to TANGEDCO till December 2018. For arguments.
34	D.R.P.No.10 of 2020	M/s.GMR Power Corpn. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to calculate the amount due and payable to the petitioner and set-off perpetuated by TANGEDCO on account of LLR and alleged Excess Payment along with interest. For arguments.

35	M.P.No.25 of 2020	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 72 MW solar power project on or before 31 st March 2016. For further arguments of the petitioner.
36	M.P.No.26 of 2020	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 216 MW solar power project on or before 31 st March 2016. For further arguments of the petitioner.
37	R.A.No.3 of 2020	(i) Ind-Bharat Power Gencome Limited (ii) M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd. (iii) MALCO Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Dev Dakshan for P-1 Adv. Rahul Balaji for P-2 & P-3 Adv.M.Gopinathan	In W.P.No.18129 of 2011, the Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 30.8.2019 set-aside the orders of this Commission in P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2011 dated 11.7.2011 and remanded back to the Commission. For arguments of the respondent.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission